

REMARKS

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

More specifically, the Examiner alleges that the language, “detecting section detecting a keyword from a character string that is being input by the character input function” can be reasonably interpreted in more than one manner. According to the Examiner, the first interpretation can be “as a detecting section detecting a keyword, where the keyword is being input by the character input function, from a character string.” Alternatively, the second interpretation, according to the Examiner, can be as “a detecting section detecting a keyword from a character string, where the character is being input by the character input function.”

The Examiner states that it is difficult to understand which “concept” the phrase “that is being input” is qualifying and states that the claim “limitations” should be clarified to distinctly claim the invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-24 are not indefinite. In accordance with proper rules of English grammar, as the phrase, “that is being input by the character input function” is situated near the term “a character string,” the phrase clearly modifies the term “character string.” Thus, according to the language of claim 1, a character string is being input by the character input function and the detecting section detects a keyword from the character string that is being input. Therefore, the claims are not indefinite.

On page 3, claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over a website excerpt by Ceantar in view of Hatakeyama (U.S. 5469354).

In Ceantar, a list of dictionaries is presented to a user to allow a user to select which dictionary to use.

In at least one embodiment of the present invention, during a time when the input characters of the character string are defined, a plurality of dictionaries are selected as search targets.

On page 7 of the current Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Ceantar suggests “most of” the feature identified by the language, “a detection section detecting a keyword from a character string that is being input by the character input function,” as Ceantar does teach

searching for a character string in the text of a dictionary, according to the Examiner. See current Office Action, page 8, lines 2-6.

Applicants have amended claim 1, for example, to include the recitation, "wherein said issuing section issues the search request for the dictionary data specified by the keyword, with respect to a plurality of dictionaries which are selected as search targets during a time when said input characters of the character string are defined." Applicants have also amended claims 1, 4, 8, 11, and 14-24.

Applicants respectfully submit that currently amended independent claims of the present invention are patentable over Ceantar in view of Hatakeyama, as neither Ceantar nor Hatakeyama, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests, "wherein said issuing section issues the search request for the dictionary data specified by the keyword, with respect to a plurality of *dictionaries which are selected as search targets during a time when said input characters of the character string are defined*," as recited by currently amended claim 1, for example, of the present invention [emphasis added].

In contrast to the present invention, in Ceantar, a list of dictionaries is simply presented to a user to allow the user to determine which of the dictionaries the user wishes to use. In Ceantar, dictionary selection does not occur during a time when input characters of a character string are defined, as in the present invention. Merely providing a user with a list of dictionaries is not tantamount to or related to selecting dictionaries as search targets during a time when said input characters of the character string are defined.

As Hatakeyama is directed to retrieving documents from a database, Hatakeyama does not teach or suggest selecting dictionaries as search targets as identified by the language of claim 1, for example.

Therefore, amended independent claims 1, 4, 8, 11 and 13-24 are patentable over Ceantar in view of Hatakeyama. As dependent claim 2 depends from independent claim 1, dependent claim 2 is patentable over the references for at least the reason presented for independent claim 1.

Dependent claims 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Ceantar, Brown, Brandt, Tran, and Hatakeyama. As none of the references, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the feature of the present invention identified by the above-quoted language of claim 1, for example,

the dependent claims are patentable over the references for at least the reason presented above (the other independent claims have been amended in a manner similar to that of claim 1).

Applicants have added new claim 25 and respectfully submit that new claim 25 is patentable over the references, as none of the references, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest, "selecting at least one program while defining characters of the character string; and displaying output from the program," as recited in claim 25.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after the response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to the matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1/18/06

By: 

Reginald D. Lucas
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501